

**STATE OF INDIANA**

**INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

In the Matter of the Petition of	)	
Indiana Bell Telephone Company,	)	
Incorporated d/b/a Ameritech Indiana	)	
Pursuant to I.C. 8-1-2-61 For a Three	)	Cause No. 41657
Phase Process For Commission	)	
Review of Various Submissions of	)	
Ameritech Indiana to Show Compliance	)	
with Section 271(c) of The Telecommunications	)	
Act of 1996	)	

**JOINT PROGRESS REPORT, STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES, ISSUES MATRIX AND  
PROPOSAL FOR PROCEDURAL ORDER**

**I. JOINT PROGRESS REPORT.**

The undersigned parties to this case submit this Joint Progress Report concerning the status of the ongoing Ameritech OSS third party testing collaborative and the Performance Measurement collaboratives, which the Commission recently incorporated into this case. In particular, this report addresses the progress that has been made on the “A-AA” issues set forth in Attachment 1 to this filing, performance measurements and remedies. This report also codifies certain agreements reached by the parties to the OSS third party testing and performance measurement collaboratives.

Based on the progress achieved in Illinois, Ohio, Michigan and Wisconsin which has built on efforts in other states, the parties agree that none of the issues set forth below need to be raised with the Commission at this time. Instead, the undersigned parties request that the Commission issue a procedural entry adopting the recommended procedures and dates for raising unresolved issues with the Commission as set forth below.

## **BACKGROUND**

On February 2, 2000, Indiana Bell Telephone Company, Incorporated d/b/a Ameritech Indiana filed pursuant to I.C. 8-1-2-61 and section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, a petition requesting that the Commission investigate various submissions of Ameritech Indiana showing compliance with Section 271(c) of TA-96. Ameritech Indiana requested that the first phase of this investigation involve a third-party test of Ameritech Indiana's Operations Support Systems ("OSS").

On Friday, April 14, an attorneys' conference was held at which time the Commission notified all parties as to the procedures by which Phase I of this proceeding would be commenced. The Parties were also informed that the Commission was utilizing Mr. Frank Darr from NRRI to assist the Commission in the development of the overall strategy and preparation of the Commission's RFP process.

On April 24, 2000, the Presiding officers issued a docket entry stating that in order to take advantage of the economies of the 271 proceedings in other Ameritech states, the Commission is considering hiring Mr. John Kern to be the facilitator of the collaborative process throughout this proceeding. The Commission also stated its plans to pursue an RFP proposal to select a project administrator who will serve as surrogate staff and be advisory in nature. Lastly, the Commission asked parties to comment on those topics that were discussed at the April 14, 2000 attorneys' conference. The parties were given until May 1, 2000 to file their responses to the Commission's proposal and until May 8, 2000 to file any replies. On May 18, 2000, the Presiding officers issued a docket entry which found that Mr. Kern should be hired and Ameritech Indiana should arrange, at its sole expense, for the retention of Mr. Kern. The docket entry also granted Ameritech Indiana's request, as presented in its May 8 reply comments, that

the Commission schedule a time for Mr. Terry Appenzeller of Ameritech to give a presentation on the proposed 271 review process, with an opportunity for questions and answers with Commissioners, IURC staff and other parties. This informational meeting was originally scheduled for June 16, 2000 and subsequently, on July 7, an informational meeting with Terry Appenzeller and John Kern was held.

On May 26, 2000, the Presiding officers issued a docket entry seeking comment on the relationship between Cause No. 41324, the Commission's generic investigation into Indiana ILEC Operations Support Systems (Sprint/United, GTE, and Ameritech Indiana), and Cause No. 41657. Specifically, the Presiding officers asked parties to respond to a number of questions. Parties filed their comments on June 8, 2000 and their reply comments on June 14, 2000. In addition, on June 30, 2000, Ms. Charlotte TerKeurst filed a Report on performance measures in Cause No. 41324 as an investigator of the incumbent local exchange carriers' provision of operating support systems. Based upon the comments and the Report as filed, the Presiding Officers found that the proceedings in Cause No. 41324 should be deferred. Specifically, the Presiding Officers found that the OSS performance measures and other unresolved OSS issues applicable to Ameritech Indiana should be considered in this proceeding.

On July 10, 2000, the Commission issued a docket entry which contained guidance on how the first workshop should be conducted. Any party who wishes to participate may do so, as long as that party accepts the record as is and formally petitions to intervene in this proceeding. Everything said or provided during the workshop will be a part of the record of this proceeding. The role of MTG and Commission staff in the workshop was set forth, including the requirement to be bound by the ex parte rules. The workshop was to be transcribed and posted on the Commission's website. Mr. Kern was responsible for the preparation and submission of a

Report, including the Statement of Principles to be filed with the Commission within 10 days after the workshop, unless the deadline was extended. Parties were given the opportunity to file reply comments, including objections and/or recommended changes to the issues in the Report.

On July 17, 2000, Mr. Kern requested an extension of time to file the first Report until July 28, 2000 which was granted the same day by the Presiding Officers.

On July 11, the first collaborative workshop in Cause No. 41657 was held. As discussed in more detail below, significant progress was achieved during this initial workshop. First, the parties agreed on a Statement of Principles that was based upon a similar statement developed in Wisconsin. Second, the parties agreed upon an approach to address a number of product, process and OSS issues that are being addressed in Illinois, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin, in a manner that brings the benefits of those enhancements to Indiana in the same time and manner. Finally, the parties agreed to a proposed procedural process for this proceeding.

Such significant progress was largely due to the fact that during the past several months the Commission Staff, OUCC, CLECs and Ameritech have met numerous times in an effort to resolve the issues raised in the Performance Measurement workshops. In addition, CLEC and Ameritech representatives have been meeting in Ohio, Michigan and Illinois on the same issues as well as OSS-related issues. During the course of these meetings the parties identified the issues which the parties agreed must be addressed as part of the Commission's review of Ameritech's OSS, performance measurements and remedies that will take place in this case, Cause No. 41657. A description of the issues and issues matrix was developed by the parties in other states. See Attachments 1 and 2. As set forth in the attached issues matrix the current status of each of the issues varies, with some considered resolved, subject to implementation and

third party testing, and others subject to a review of additional information and further negotiation. Recently the parties reached agreement in Michigan and a formal agreement in Wisconsin on the appropriate procedure to follow for all of the A-AA issues. As a result of the work of all these collaboratives, on July 11, 2000 significant progress was accomplished as detailed below. At this time the parties are continuing to review Ameritech's proposed solutions and implementation plans and further negotiations are scheduled to take place.

The parties also discussed the development of a Master Test Plan ("MTP") at the July 11, 2000 workshop. A master test plan is also being discussed in a Michigan collaborative. The parties have agreed to use the Michigan test plan as a baseline for developing the Indiana MTP. The Michigan master test plan is expected to be available approximately August 9, 2000.

As a result of this progress, the parties agree that it is unnecessary to bring these issues to the Commission at this time. In fact, a contested proceeding at this time would be counterproductive to the parties' effort to resolve the issues. The parties request that the Commission issue a Procedural Order approving this Joint Progress Report and Proposal for Procedural Order.

## **II. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES.**

1. Product, Process and OSS Enhancements. Ameritech Indiana agrees that, at a minimum, certain enhancements to the existing products, processes, or operational support systems ("OSS") need to be made to the extent possible, prior to beginning third party testing related to such products, processes or OSS. Ameritech Indiana agrees to implement, at a minimum, the enhancements to existing products, processes or OSS as reflected in the "Resolved" column in the document attached hereto as Attachment 1. These time frames for implementing changes in Indiana are the same as those agreed to in Wisconsin; and as

established in the collaborative workshop that was held July 11, 2000 in Cause No. 41657. Any disputes regarding enhancements that should be made, including but not limited to the time frame for implementing the agreed to enhancements, will be presented to the Commission in accordance with the expedited dispute resolution process set forth in Paragraph 7 below. In addition to these agreed to enhancements, the parties agree to discuss the issues in the Unresolved column on Attachment 1 . As established in the July 11, 2000 workshop, the parties agree that the resolution of these unresolved issues, including the timetable for implementing them in Indiana, will be consistent with the outcomes in either Wisconsin or Michigan, except to the extent the parties to Cause No. 41657 agree that an Indiana-specific outcome or timetable is appropriate. Any disputes regarding the resolution of these unresolved issues will be presented to the Commission in accordance with the expedited dispute resolution process set forth below.

2. Performance Measures. Ameritech Indiana agrees to discuss expanding the Texas performance measures to include xDSL loop performance measures, as well as other new performance measures focusing on new products, including UNE-P. The third party test will also include measures for jeopardy, held orders, change management, and "hot cuts", as well as new systems that may result from the discussions in this collaborative workshop or Commission direction. The specifics of these new performance measurements, business rules, and calculations, and a performance assurance plan shall be discussed and, to the extent possible, mutual agreement between Ameritech Indiana and the CLECs shall be established. The Company also agrees that to the extent one of the other Ameritech operating companies voluntarily agreed<sup>1</sup> to a performance assurance plan, a parity or benchmark measure, including any subsequent performance measurement modification, deletion or addition, it will not oppose

---

<sup>1</sup> The term "voluntary agreement" as used in this attachment does not include an agreement reached pursuant to a state commission directive, but it may include agreements reached pursuant to collaborative sessions ordered by state commissions. For purposes of this attachment only, the term "voluntary agreement" does not include those Ameritech Illinois performance measurements which include a parity standard. This fact does not negate a parties' right to argue, entirely independent of this Attachment 2, to the Commission that any resolution of performance measures in Illinois was "voluntary" and "agreed to" by Ameritech and should be adopted in Indiana .

the adoption of that performance assurance plan, benchmark or parity measure or performance measurement modification in this proceeding.

3. Third party tester. The parties agree that the Commission should approve, at Ameritech Indiana's expense, an independent third party to conduct a comprehensive test of Ameritech Indiana's OSS, its business rules and an audit of its Performance Measures. During the July 11, 2000 collaborative workshop, the Parties agreed that KPMG Consulting LLC's a suitably qualified entity, and should be approved as the third-party testing agent. Ameritech Indiana represents that KPMG consulting LLC is conducting similar testing in the other four Ameritech states and does not have an existing or pending disqualifying business conflict with SBC/Ameritech, including any subsidiaries or affiliates. The parties agree that although the third party tester will be retained by Ameritech Indiana, at its expense, the terms of the hiring contract, shall be subject ultimately to the direction and control of the Commission and/or its designated agents. The parties also agree that the third party tester may accept direction from future OSS collaborative workshops, subject to Commission oversight and control. The terms of the contract for hire of such third party tester shall be subject to Commission review and approval.

4. Pseudo-CLEC Testing. The parties also agreed during the July 11, 2000 workshop that third party testing shall include the use of a pseudo-CLEC, whose retention shall be subject to Commission approval. During the July 11, 2000 workshop the parties agreed that Hewlett Packard (HP) should be approved for this purpose. If approved by this Commission the pseudo-CLEC would be retained by Ameritech Indiana at its expense, as a separate contract. By the terms of the hiring contract, the pseudo-CLEC shall be subject to the direction of the Commission and/or its designated agents. The pseudo-CLEC should be used in the test to build the OSS interfaces necessary to determine whether Ameritech Indiana's systems and documentation are sufficient to permit CLECs to develop their OSS in order to enter the market. Ameritech shall provide no greater guidance and information to the pseudo-CLEC than that currently made available to any other CLEC operating within the state.

5. Prompt Retention of Testing Agents. Although Ameritech Indiana will be paying all costs for the test, including the cost of the pseudo-CLEC, the Parties agree that the third party testing agent and the pseudo-CLEC shall take their direction exclusively from the Commission unless otherwise agreed by the parties in Cause No. 41657. Because Ameritech Indiana has represented that it will not seek to recover the costs of such testing in retail or wholesale rates, the Parties agree that KPMG Consulting LLC should be promptly retained as the third party testing agent and that HP be promptly retained as the firm to act as the pseudo-CLEC. The Indiana Commission shall in all events retain full authority to ensure that the test is designed and conducted, and the results are evaluated and reported consistent with the master test plan to all parties, in accordance with the needs of the Commission.

6. Third Party Master Test Plan. During the July 11, 2000 workshop the parties agreed that the third party OSS test plan for Indiana should be modeled after and based upon the test plan and tests conducted in other Ameritech states, including, but not limited to, the plan and tests conducted on behalf of the Michigan Public Service Commission. The proposed Master Test Plan being developed in Michigan was based upon a similar test plan approved by the Florida Public Service Commission to test the OSS of Bell South (Florida). As agreed to during the July 11, 2000 workshop, the final Indiana Master Test Plan will take into account the needs of providers in Indiana, as agreed to by the participants in Cause No. 41657 or as determined by the Commission.

The third party OSS test, using commercial volumes and capacity testing as determined by the collaborative, shall be conducted military style (test until pass). Testing for a scenario is not considered completed in a satisfactory manner until such time as the performance meets or exceeds performance standards established for the relevant metrics in advance of initiation of testing. All corrective actions shall be subjected to retesting.

The parties agree that the CLECs shall at a minimum: (1) have the opportunity to verify what is being tested; (2) receive a list of all documentation that Ameritech Indiana provides to



the third party tester; and (3) be permitted to verify that the pseudo-CLEC is using the same information that Ameritech Indiana provides to the CLECs.

Carrier-to-carrier testing using commercial volumes, friendly testing of lines into a central location as requested by a CLEC, and capacity testing will be performed as determined by the participants in Cause No. 41657 or the Commission. The collaborative will determine the exact number of lines that should be part of any friendly test.

7. Dispute Resolution. The Parties reserve the right to escalate any issues whenever an impasse is reached in the collaborative workshop, to the Commission for resolution by whatever lawful process the Commission determines to be appropriate. Issues may be raised for Commission resolution pursuant to the procedures set forth below.

Parties may advocate additional issues, such as more OSS enhancements, along with associated performance measurements, and necessary modifications to any third-party tests. Not addressing any particular issue in this Joint Progress Report and Approval for Procedural Order should not be taken to mean acquiescence with the position of any other party.

The parties agree to follow the processes outlined in the Commission's proposed rule governing expedited resolution of disputes (RM99-08) for the resolution of disputes arising from the OSS Statement of Principles subject to Commission approval.

This procedure is not intended to preclude Ameritech Indiana and the participant(s) bringing the complaint from mutually agreeing to a different procedure. Nothing in this Section precludes any party from proposing for Commission adoption a more expedited procedure for the resolution of disputes arising from Cause Nos. 41324 and 41657.

### **III. ISSUES MATRIX.**

Activity in the July 11, 2000 collaborative workshop was devoted primarily to the to the A-AA issues, the selection of the test vendor and the development of a master test plan. These

issues address Ameritech operations that various parties have alleged “need to be fixed” and OSS functionality that various parties believe must be promptly implemented. All of the parties agree that these issues need to be included in the master test plan and reflected in the performance measures and remedy plan. All of the parties further agree that these issues need to be resolved prior to completion of third party testing. Accordingly, resolving the A-AA issues was a priority in the meetings along with the test plan development. Attachment 1 attached summarizes in table form the status of the A-AA issues. The following represents the status of these issues:

8. LSOG4 and GUI Deployment. In other Ameritech states, the parties were at an impasse in the collaboratives with respect to the timing and nature of the deployment of certain OSS functionalities, including functionalities that will be included in the deployment of Ameritech’s application to application interface (Issues I, R, J, K T, U, and portions of F and L) and its graphical user interface (GUI) providing such functionality (as set forth in portions of Issues A, B, C, and D). To the extent these OSS functionalities are defined and resolved on or before September 15, 2000, in the FCC’s collaborative proceedings under the SBC/Ameritech Uniform and Enhanced OSS Plan of Record, those functionalities will be documented and implemented as defined in those FCC proceedings. If these functionalities are not resolved in those proceedings on or before September 15, 2000, any party may submit those issues to the Commission for resolution. In any event, these OSS functionality upgrades will be announced and implemented in a manner consistent with SBC's 13 State Change Management process. If the SBC 13 State Change Management process is not agreed to by August 11, 2000, the change management process set forth in Attachment A to the SBC/Ameritech Uniform and Enhanced OSS Plan of Record (which is attached hereto as Attachment 3) will be used; provided that if the SBC 13 State Change Management process has not been agreed to by August 11, 2000, the

parties agree to continue negotiations or if an impasse is reached, to ask the FCC and/or the Commission to resolve the issue. In the event that Attachment 3 is used as an interim approach, the parties agree to discuss modifications to the intervals and dates provided in Attachment 3 to achieve timely upgrades in these OSS functionalities consistent with the dates for implementation of these OSS functionalities developed in this proceeding.

As a result of the collaborative meetings in other states, Ameritech Indiana will investigate the possibility of deploying these OSS functionalities prior to March 2001. While Ameritech Indiana continues to believe it is not feasible to deploy these OSS functionalities prior to the current deployment date of March 2001, Ameritech Indiana will escalate this issue to the senior management of SBC, its parent company, to determine whether the deployment date can be accelerated. Ameritech shall continue to pursue escalation to the highest levels of SBC, regarding the acceleration of this LSOG4 functionality and GUI deployment providing such functionality to a date earlier than March 2001. Ameritech Indiana shall report to the parties and the Commission on the status of such escalation efforts within 30 days of the Commission's order approving this Joint Progress Report and Proposal for Procedural Order and every 30 days thereafter.

9. Interim GUI Offer. If within 30 days of the Commission's order granting this Report and Order, Ameritech Indiana reports that it is unable to accelerate to October 1, 2000, the deployment of its GUI, as described in paragraph 10 of this Order, Ameritech shall work with CLECs to provide GUI service arrangement(s) for unbundled loops (with or without LNP), resale and UNE-P, through a third-party provider, during the interim period beginning on October 1, 2000. Ameritech Indiana shall pay all, or some portion of, the charges applicable to the GUI service arrangement(s). The amount and nature of Ameritech's funding commitment

will be determined between the parties based upon the projected charges applicable to the GUI service arrangement(s). Such payments shall apply to electronic orders submitted to Ameritech Indiana on or after October 1, 2000, and shall end when Ameritech Indiana deploys its permanent GUI, on or before March 2001.

Within one week of the Commission's order granting this Joint Progress Report and Proposal for Procedural Order, any CLEC party interested in pursuing this proposed GUI service arrangement shall notify Ameritech of its interest, including the identity of potential GUI providers. With respect to a third party GUI service arrangement to support the ordering of UNE-P, Ameritech Indiana shall also provide appropriate documentation and technical assistance to facilitate the development of GUI service arrangement(s) that allow the electronic ordering of UNE-P no later than October 1, 2000. Within 30 days of the Commission's order approving this Joint Progress Report and Proposal for Procedural Order, Ameritech Indiana shall report to the parties on the status of such GUI service arrangement(s). At such time, if there are unresolved issues that are at an impasse, the parties may request dispute resolution pursuant to Paragraph 7 concerning those unresolved terms and conditions of the interim GUI offering(s) and concerning acceleration of the deployment of Ameritech's GUI.

10. New Product Introductions. Ameritech has agreed to deploy certain new products and services. The parties have been unable to determine if problems exist regarding these products and services because they had not yet been deployed or have just been deployed. To the extent that the parties are unable to resolve any problems arising from or relating to the deployment of these products and services during further collaborative sessions, the matters shall

be raised with the Commission by October 23, 2000.<sup>2</sup> Ameritech shall provide to the parties the following products and services on or before the following dates:

<b><u>Issue</u></b>	<b><u>Product/Service</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>
B	UNE-P – Proposed Tariff filed	TBA
B	UNE-P – Implementation of Resolved Issues	September 30, 2000
C	Line Sharing – Documentation available	June 15, 2000
C	Resolution of unresolved Issues (e.g., UNE-P line splitting)	September 30, 2000
C	Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) Provisioning Contract Amendment – Available	June 15, 2000
C	Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) Provisioning Contract Amendment – Implementation of Resolved Issues	September 30, 2000
D	Sub-Loops -- Documentation available	May 18, 2000
D	Sub-Loops – Process to identify “Points of Access”	August 25, 2000
D	Sub-Loops -- Implementation of Resolved Issues	September 27, 2000
E	Dark Fiber -- Documentation available	May 18, 2000
E	Dark Fiber – Implementation of Resolved Issues	September 30, 2000
V	Enhanced Extended Links	unresolved <sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The parties agree that many issues relating to these products and services (such as pricing and terms and conditions for UNE-P, UNE-P line splitting, line sharing in general and EELs) may well be raised prior to October 23, 2000 in either upcoming arbitration proceedings, the Commission’s ongoing TELRIC docket or otherwise. In other words, parties may raise issues regarding these products and services before October 23, 2000 in whatever docket they feel is appropriate.

<sup>3</sup> EELS may be an unresolved issue in Indiana if the parties disagree as to whether EELS is legally required.

(EELS)

11. . UNE-P. Ameritech has agreed to provide to the parties and file with the Commission a proposed tariff for UNE-P when directed by the Commission in Cause No. 40611.<sup>4</sup>

12. . OSS Enhancements/Process Improvements. The parties have reached tentative agreement on enhancements and process improvements to Ameritech's OSS which are designed to resolve various issues. While tentative agreement exists, implementation of a number of the enhancements and process improvements by Ameritech will occur during July through September 2000. In addition, CLECs must validate that the solutions to OSS problems included in the OSS enhancements and process improvements, in fact resolve the problems. To the extent that the parties reach impasse during further collaborative sessions as to whether the proposed solutions resolve the problems, those matters shall be submitted to the Commission for resolution by October 23, 2000. Ameritech shall provide to the parties and implement the following OSS enhancements, processes and procedures on or before the following dates:<sup>5</sup>

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Process/Procedure</u>	<u>Date</u>
A	Facilities Availability Process	June 15, 2000
A	Improved Escalation Process Concerning Facility Assignment	June 15, 2000
A	Procedures for Requesting and Receiving by Central Office DLC Loop Percentages	September 1,2000
A	Facility Problem Notification Within 24 Hours of a Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) (See F	September 1, 2000

---

<sup>4</sup> There is an unresolved issue in Indiana between the parties as to what combinations are legally required.

<sup>5</sup> The table references the identification of issues as set forth in Attachment 1. . The process, procedures, and dates contained in this table are subject to change, pursuant to discussions among the parties during collaborative sessions.

below)

C	Loop Assignment for DSL	September 30, 2000
F	New Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) and Facility Modification Process – Documentation Available	June 2, 2000
F	New Facility Modification Process – Identify Facility Problems and Notify CLEC of modification or build options	September 1, 2000
F	New Firm Order Confirmation Process – Incorporate version numbers and reason codes on revised FOCs	September 27, 2000
G	Hot Cut Procedures	July 1, 2000
G	Hot Cut Procedures – ISDN-xDSL	July 1, 2000
H	Street Address Guide (SAG) to CSR Conversion (abbreviated validation)	September 1, 2000
L	Directory Assistance/Directory Publishing	a. June 30, 2000
	a. Provide current SBC documentation on its “Retain Current Listing” process	b. June 30, 2000
	b. Provide current AAS documentation on its Order and Query Process via website	c. March, 2001
	c. Implement a process to allow CLECs the option to retain current listings, except on partials	d. September, 2001
	d. Provide interface (or work-around) for integrated directory listings ordering	

	ability. Ameritech agrees to eliminate the need for two interfaces by September, 2001. A single interface that is integrated into the current loop ordering processes, including ASR/Telis, will be provided not later than September 1, 2001.	e. September, 2000
	e. Ameritech will improve coordination between account team and directory publishing and directory assistance personnel.	
M	E911 Database Management  (confirm parity between Ameritech and CLECs regarding use of SAG)	September 1, 2000
N	Customer Premise Access -- Provide Copies of Policy	June 30, 2000
O	Replacement of Internal Network Interface Devices (NIDs)	September 30, 2000
P	TC/Net Change Process	September 30, 2000
Q	LEC Protection	Under Review
Q	LEC Protection -- LOA Policy	August 1, 2000
S	Flow Through	September 30, 2000
W	Branded Operator Services	August 1, 2000
X	Partial Migrations	Ameritech policy retained.
Y	Account Management Process – Edited Ameritech Handbook	August 1, 2000
Y	Account Management Process – Coordination Between Account Team and Directory Listing and Directory Assistance	August 1, 2000
Z	Collocation Ordering, Rates,	July 31, 2000



Auditing and Record Keeping  
Processes

AA

LNP 10-Digit Trigger Ordering

July 31, 2000

13. . Third Party Testing. (1) The third party OSS testing approved by this Commission will include testing of the OSS pre-ordering, ordering and provisioning functionalities referred to in paragraphs 8, 10, 11 and 12 and provided by the application to application and GUI interfaces referred to in paragraph 8 (hereinafter in this paragraph referred to as “Paragraph 13 functionalities”); and (2) such third party testing will not conclude until the Paragraph 13 functionalities are deployed (consistent with paragraph 8 ) and tested. Accordingly, the OSS testing approved by this Commission shall include these Paragraph 13 functionalities. Moreover, the third party testing shall not conclude and shall not be deemed complete until these Paragraph 13 functionalities are tested.

14. . Performance Measures and Remedies. The parties have met a number of times in the performance measurements workshops in Cause No. 41324 to discuss the requirements from the Interim Joint Stipulation, filed in that case. In addition, the parties continue to meet to discuss additions, deletions, or changes to the performance measurements, standards/benchmarks and remedies that are being implemented by Ameritech. The parties agree that they have not had a sufficient opportunity to complete their discussions, and will continue to discuss these issues using the collaborative workshop in this case.

Under the terms of the Interim Joint Stipulation the performance measurement collaborative could continue to meet for some time, potentially even after the third party test has been completed. As a result, in order to resolve any issues relating to additions, deletions and changes to the Texas baseline measurements that parties believe must be included in the third

party test, the parties request that the Commission establish October 23 , 2000 as the date by which unresolved performance measurement and remedy issues that parties believe must be included in the third party test must be raised with the Commission. The parties agree that the third party test ordered by the Commission will not be deemed complete until Ameritech has implemented all additions, deletions and changes that are agreed to by the parties or that the Commission determines should be a part of the test. If other additions, deletions and changes to the Texas baseline measurements occur after October 23, 2000, they will be encompassed in the third party test subject to agreement of the parties or as ordered by the Commission.

#### **IV. PROPOSAL FOR PROCEDURAL PROCESS.**

Pursuant to the Commission's docket entry dated July 10, 2000, the Presiding Officers indicated that they intend to issue a Procedural Order in this Cause. At the collaborative workshop held on July 11, 2000, the parties reached agreement on a process for identifying, discussing and attempting to resolve the remaining issues in this phase. The parties respectfully request that the Commission approve the provisions set forth in this Joint Progress Report and Proposal for Procedural Order.

15. Further Collaborative Workshops. The parties shall participate in a further series of collaborative workshops. Through these collaboratives the parties will attempt to identify the issues remaining in this phase of the proceeding and will continue to attempt to reach agreement on as many substantive issues as possible. These collaborative workshops shall be scheduled throughout the months of July through October 20, 2000, as often as necessary, to permit the parties to reach agreement on the remaining issues in this phase. These collaborative workshops should be completed by October 20 , 2000.

16. . Report. At such time as the facilitator, John Kern, concludes that the parties have exhausted their abilities to identify issues and reach agreements during the further collaborative workshops, Mr. Kern shall prepare a l report containing at least the following information: (1) a listing of all test design and implementation parameters (performance measures, benchmarks, pre-testing system upgrades or improvements, testing sequences, business processes, etc.) upon which the parties have reached agreement and seek Commission acceptance of the parameters in the order concluding this phase, and (2) a statement of disputed issues which John Kern and the parties recommend be made subject to the Attorneys' conference as discussed in paragraph 21 below. . The l report shall be presented to the Commission for review with sufficient time to permit Commission action, as appropriate, but no later than October 23, 2000. To the extent the parties reach agreement on certain issues, including a proposed Master Test Plan, prior to October 23, 2000, Mr. Kern shall provide interim report(s) to the Commission on those items. The Commission may take action on the items contained in such report(s) when it deems appropriate and may accept or modify those items in whole or in part.

17. . Collaborative Management Function. The appointment of John Kern as facilitator, pursuant to the Commission docket entry dated May 18, 2000, shall continue through the further collaborative workshops. Ameritech Indiana, at its sole expense, shall continue to retain Mr. Kern under contract, which shall provide for Commission (including staff) direction and control of Mr. Kern's activities. Mr. Kern's function shall involve the discretion to plan, schedule, and implement activities to achieve the objectives of the further collaborative workshops.

18. Staff Participation in Collaborative Workshops. Commission staff assigned to this docket, including Frank Darr of NRRI and MTG Consulting as "surrogate staff" (hereinafter collectively known as "Commission Staff"), may participate in the further collaborative workshops and the

hearings to carry out their advisory functions, including such functions asking clarifying questions. However, Commission Staff and all parties are bound by the Commission's ex parte rules, 170 IAC 1-1-1.5-1 et seq. If the Commission Staff participates in preparing documents to be included in John Kern's reports to the Commission, all parties should receive a copy of the Commission Staff input and have the opportunity to comment thereon. If the Commission Staff is directed to prepare a report pursuant to IC 8-1-1-5(b), the Commission Staff must be made available for cross examination for factual inquiries.

19. . Transcript of Collaborative Workshops. The collaborative workshop held on July 11, 2000 was transcribed at Ameritech Indiana's expense and instructions on how to receive copies of the transcripts will be posted on the Commission's website. The parties agreed that further transcription of future collaborative workshops held in this case is not necessary. John Kern will provide a short written report at the conclusion of each collaborative to be posted on the Commission's website within two business days identifying the agenda for the next collaborative workshop as well as the time, date and location of the next collaborative workshop.

20. Confidential Information. Any information submitted to the parties and OUCC, in this case that is verified by Ameritech Indiana to be confidential, proprietary, competitively sensitive or trade secret shall be exempt from disclosure under IC 8-1-2-29 and will be provided to the parties and OUCC only pursuant to an appropriate non-disclosure agreement.

21. Attorneys' Conference. The administrative law judge shall schedule an attorneys' conference no later than November 10, 2000, to consider further matters in this proceeding, including the scheduling of a hearing date.

22. Future Phases. As noted in the Background Section above, this proceeding is the result of a Petition filed by Ameritech Indiana on February 2, 2000. That Petition included as Exhibit A, a proposed three-phase process for this Commission's review of Ameritech Indiana's submissions to show compliance with Section 271(c) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 prior to filing a Section 271 application with the Federal Communications Commission. Ameritech Indiana has represented to the parties during the collaborative workshops that the principles, issues and processes described in this Joint Progress Report should apply to this Cause No. 41657 to the extent there is any conflict or inconsistency between this Joint Progress Report and such Petition, including Exhibit A. Moreover, Ameritech Indiana has represented to the parties in the collaborative workshops that it intends to follow the remaining portions of the proposed three-phase process, which includes a "checklist " compliance review (Phase II) and a review of the final master test plan report and actual performance results (Phase III), subject to changes that are either agreed to by the parties or as ordered by the Commission. Nothing in this paragraph 22, however, precludes any party from proposing to the Commission a different process for addressing any Phase II or III items that are not addressed in this Joint Progress Report.

The undersigned parties request that the Commission issue an entry consistent with this Joint Progress Report and Proposal for Procedural Order.

Respectfully submitted,

## **Attachments**

1. Issues Matrix
2. Description of A-AA Issues
3. Attachment A to the SBC/Ameritech Uniform and Enhanced OSS Plan of Record

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of Ameritech Indiana's Joint Progress Report and Proposal for Procedural Order was served upon counsel for all parties as shown on the attached service list by regular U.S. mail, postage prepaid, this \_\_\_\_ day of July, 2000.

---

Sue E. Stemen